



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,639	09/25/2001	Mark Kevin O'Connor	146381.00001	2501
7590 11/09/2005				
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP 1501 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005		EXAMINER HAN, QI		
		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2654		

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/937,639	Applicant(s) O'CONNOR, MARK KEVIN	
	Examiner Qi Han	Art Unit 2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13,27-32 and 40-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13,27-32 and 40-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/31/02&2/7/02</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

U.S.C. National Stage Application

1. Acknowledgement is made of the indication that the present application is filed under 35 U.S.C. 371, of the indication that the required form PCT/DO/ED/903 is present, and of the use of transmittal form PCT/DO/EO/1390. Thus, the present application is being treated as a filing under 35 U.S.C. 371.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on 01/31/2002 and 02/07/2002 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

Election/Restrictions

4. Applicant's election without traverse of invention Group 1, claims 1-13, 27-32 and 40-47 in the reply filed on 08/09/2005 (pages 2-3) is acknowledged. It noted that claim 74 should not belong to invention Group I (examiner made an error), because Group II had included claim 74 and claim 74 depends on claim 14 (also in Group II) (see the previous office action, Group II and the claim).

Art Unit: 2654

Claims 14-26, 33-39 and 48-76 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention (Groups 2-4). Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 08/09/2005 (pages 2-3).

It is reminded that this response filed 07/05/2005 contains claims 14-26, 33-39 and 48-76 drawn to an invention nonelected without traverse. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. On page 21, starting line 20, the underline of the terms in the specification should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.
 - b. There are many typographical errors in the specification and claims, such as page 21, lines 27, words [wordelement], line 33, words [closelyconnected], line 37, word [of]; page 57, line 5, word [towhich], line 14, words [to the]. Appropriate correction is required.

Since the underline terms and the typographical errors, as stated in a. and b. above, are spread throughout the specification, the lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Art Unit: 2654

Examiner suggests that the applicant provide a substitute specification including the claims pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125(a) because too many errors need to be corrected.

It is reminded that a substitute specification must not contain new matter. The substitute specification must be submitted with markings showing all the changes relative to the immediate prior version of the specification of record. The text of any added subject matter must be shown by underlining the added text. The text of any deleted matter must be shown by strike-through except that double brackets placed before and after the deleted characters may be used to show deletion of five or fewer consecutive characters. The text of any deleted subject matter must be shown by being placed within double brackets if strike-through cannot be easily perceived. An accompanying clean version (without markings) and a statement that the substitute specification contains no new matter must also be supplied. Numbering the paragraphs of the specification of record is not considered a change that must be shown.

It is also reminded that new application papers with lines 1½ or double spaced on good quality paper are required.

c. On page 56, lines 14-22, applicant provide bibliography should be included the IDS (the Information Disclosure Statement), which should use a separate paper/document. Appropriate correction is required.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

Art Unit: 2654

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

e. On page 24, the definition of "reconversion homonyms" is unclear. Further, the example words lack sufficient description to show what the defined terms really are.

Appropriate correction or clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2654

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-13, 27-32 and 40-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitations "**the** word-shapes of **the** standard text of a language" and "**the** user" in lines 1-2 of the claim, and the limitation "**the** identity of spoken words". There are insufficient antecedent bases for these limitations in the claim.

Claims 2 and 3 recite the limitation "**the** degree" in line 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims respectively.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "depicting **the** text of an alphabetically-written natural language" in line 1 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The similar problems are also found for the limitations "the reader" in line 5 of the claim and "the user" in line 6 of the claim. Further, the limitation "**the said** range" in line 8 of the claim has an obvious error.

Further, claim 4 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationship is the relationship between the preamble limitation of "text of an alphabetically-written natural language" and the body limitation of "additional phonetic information".

Claim 5 recites the limitation "**the** portions" in line 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "**the** text of" in line 1 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The similar problem is also found for the limitations "**the** user" in line 6 of the claim. Further, the limitation "**the said** range" in line 11 of the claim has an obvious error.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "**the** grammatical or syntactical structure..." in line 1 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

In addition, claim 27 also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. This claim is an omnibus type claim.

Claim 28 recites the limitation "**the** conventional spelling of..." in line 5 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The similar problems are also found, such as the limitations "**the** number" in line 7 of the claim, "**all the** separate phonemes" in line 9 of the claim.

Further, the claim recites "a method, suitable for use in the text-processor of claim 1, of representing printed texts of ...". Since the claim is apparatus (means) claim, claim 28 becomes a hybrid claim of two statutory classes, which fails to clearly recite the claim to be one of the statutory classes and lead the claim to be indefinite. In addition, it is unclear that the limitations of "any other suitable changes...." and "word-shapes, even if ..." in the last four lines of the claim should be parallel with which other limitation element(s), so as being indefinite.

ADK Claim 40 depends on claim 6. The rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim ~~40~~⁶, because the dependent claim inherits all limitations of its parent claim(s).

Art Unit: 2654

Further, regarding claim 40, the phrase "such writing-system as" (same as "such as") in lines 4-5 of the claim renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim 44 recites the limitation "**the** user's selection of..." in line 4 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The similar problems are also found, such as the limitations "**the** resolution of" in line 4 of the claim, "**the** pronunciation and thus **the** meanings of" in line 7 of the claim.

Regarding the rest dependent claims 7-13, 29-32, 41-43 and 45-47, the rejection is based on the same reason as described above, because the dependent claims inherit all limitations of their parent claim(s).

It is reminded that since so many antecedent basis problems are found in the claims, applicant's cooperation is requested in checking and correcting the errors of which applicant may become aware in all applicant elected claims.

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Art Unit: 2654

Regarding claim 1, it recites “computer-based text processor means for facilitating ... characterised in that the user is enabled to select ...” (treated as an apparatus claim), which is a single means claim, i.e., where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means. A claim which recites, solely, a single 'means' as its function(s) is subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. In re Haytt, 708 F.2d 712, 218 USPQ 195 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

In addition, the limitation “computer-based test processor means ...non-standard texts that differ from one another according to the degree to which each said non-standard text incorporates clues to an [the] identity of spoken words that correspond to the word shapes of the non-standard text” lacks specific enablement support in the specification. The applicant fails to specifically describe how the text processor means can process standard texts associated with different non-standard texts, and how to obtain and measure the “degree to which each said non-standard text incorporates clues to an [the] identity of spoken words that correspond to the word shapes of the non-standard text”. Therefore, the claimed limitation is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

Regarding claims 2 (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, since the dependent claim does not provide any additional means or structural element(s) for the apparatus (means), so as being a single means claim. In addition, the claimed limitation itself has an enablement problem, because the limitation “the processor means ...wherein the standard text is **alphabetical** and the non-standard texts differ from one another according to the **degree to which their word-shapes incorporate phonetic clues**” lacks

Art Unit: 2654

specific enablement support in the specification. The applicant fails to specifically describe how a text processor means can process standard alphabetical texts associated with different non-standard texts, and how to obtain and measure a degree to “which their word-shapes incorporate phonetic clues”. Therefore, the claimed limitation is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

Regarding claims 3 (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, since the dependent claim does not provide any additional means or structural element(s) for the apparatus (means), so as being a single means claim. In addition, the claimed limitation itself has an enablement problem, because the limitation “text processor means ... wherein the standard text is logographic and the non-standard texts differ from one another according to the degree to which they incorporate pictographic clues” lacks specific enablement support in the specification. The applicant fails to specifically describe how a text processor means can process standard logographic texts associated with different non-standard texts, and how to obtain and measure a degree to “degree to which they incorporate pictographic clues”. Therefore, the claimed limitation is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this

Art Unit: 2654

subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by SHAW et al. (US 6,363,342 B2) hereinafter referenced as SHAW.

As per **claim 1**, as best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112, 1st and 2nd (see above), SHAW discloses system for developing word-pronunciation pairs (title) with ‘an editing tool’ (abstract) (corresponding to computer-based text processor means), comprising that:

“a [the] user is enabled to select between a plurality of non-standard texts that differ from one another according to the degree to which each said non-standard text incorporates clues to an [the] identity of spoken words that correspond to the word shapes of the non-standard text”, (Fig. 2 and col. 3, line 48 to col. 4, lines 10, ‘a graphical user interface’, ‘a user selects and manipulates the phonetic transcriptions (can be interpreted as non-standard texts)’, ‘the spelled word input (can be interpreted either standard texts or non-standard texts) may be selected from a word list’, ‘its corresponding phonetic transcription (clues to an identity of spoken words)’, ‘a list of n-best suggested phonetic transcriptions (reflecting a degree of the clues to the identity) is generated ...based upon (correspond to) the spelled word input’).

As per **claim 2** (depending on claim 1), as best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112, 1st and 2nd (see above), SHAW further discloses “the standard text is alphabetical and the non-standard texts differ from one another according to the degree to which their word-shapes incorporate phonetic clues”, (Fig. 2 and col. 3, line 48 to col. 4, lines 10, wherein ‘a list of n-best suggested phonetic transcriptions (that are broadly interpreted as different word-shapes)’).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SHAW as applied to claim 1, and further in view of SAITO et al. (US 4,777,600) hereinafter referenced as SAITO.

As per **claim 3** (depending on claim 1), as best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112, 1st and 2nd (see above), SHAW does not expressly disclose “logographic” standard text and “pictographic clues”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by SAITO who discloses phonetic data-to-Kanji character converter with a syntax analyzer to alter priority order of displayed Kanji homonyms (title), comprising compute system or a wordprocessor for processing kanji (Chinese character) (corresponding to logographic standard text) and the related phonetic data (col. 1, lines 9-45), and operation for selecting homonyms (corresponding to pictographic clues) (col. 2, lines 57-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify SAITO by providing a wordprocessor having capability of processing Kanji and the related phonetic data, including operation for selecting homonyms, as taught by SAITO, for the purpose of simplifying input operation for a computer system (SAITO: col. 1, lines 18-19).

10. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SHAW.

As per **claim 4**, as best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd (see above), SHAW discloses system for developing word-pronunciation pairs (title) with ‘an editing tool (corresponding to a text processor)’ (abstract), comprising that:

“additional phonetic information is made visible” (Fig. 2, block 26);

“said additional phonetic information is supplied while maintaining the text's conventional spelling and the basic outlines of its word-shapes, which remain recognisable to a [the] reader (user)” (Fig. 2, blocks 26 and 42; col. 3, line 48 to col. 4, lines 10, ‘a graphical user interface’);

“the user can choose the amount of additional phonetic information by choosing among a range of display-options” (Fig. 2 and col. 3, line 48 to col. 4, lines 10, ‘a user selects and manipulates the phonetic transcriptions (additional phonetic information)’, ‘the user preferably selects one of these phonetic transcriptions (that closely matches the desired pronunciation)’);

“the [said] range extends” “to a display-option in which all available additional phonetic information is displayed” (Fig. 2, block 26; col. 3, line 48 to col. 4, lines 10, ‘a list of n-best suggested phonetic transcriptions (available additional phonetic information) is generated’).

But, SHAW does not expressly disclose “the [said] range extends from [:] a display-option in which all additional phonetic information is visually suppressed”. However, SHAW discloses multiple window areas, command buttons, check boxes and other window components in the user interface (Fig.2), including ‘a list of n-best suggested phonetic transcriptions (block 26) (corresponding to a display-option in which all available additional phonetic information is displayed), ‘close’ and ‘open’ buttons, ‘Word selection’ check boxes (Fig. 2, right side), which suggests that SHAW’s system has capability of adding and modifying window components for

Art Unit: 2654

displaying user preferred arrangement of the window components in the interface. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify SHAW by providing modified window components arrangement, such as providing selection of close/open for block 26 and/or selection of a number ($\geq n$) of options (range extended) displayed in block 26, for the purpose of building upon a window environment to provide a user-friendly methodology for defining, manipulating and storing the phonetic representation (SHAW: col. 1, lines 60-65).

As per **claim 5** (depending on claim 4), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 4, because the rejection for claim 1 covers the same or similar limitations as claim 5.

11. Claims 7 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SHAW further in view of FOREST (US 6,005,549).

As per **claim 7** (depending on claim 4), SHAW does not expressly disclose “some or all of the display-options provide... some or all of the following visual indicators: diacritical marks, colors, qualities or thicknesses of line, variations to positions of letters and to letter-shapes, new letters, new alphabets, syllabaries”. However, the features are well known in the art as evidenced by FOREST who discloses user interface method and apparatus (title) for applications including data entry for ideographic language and computer access and speech synthesis (abstract), comprising ‘selectable region (window component)’, ‘selection event’, ‘changing location (position), size, shape, hue (color)...pattern, hatching, font...’(col. 38, lines 57-67), which suggests that the system has capability of implementing the functionality, as claimed for

Art Unit: 2654

the window components. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify SHAW by providing various selections including location, size, shape, hue, hatching, font and other features for window components, as taught by FOREST, for the purpose (motivation) of offering user-friendly interface and manipulating user preferred arrangement of window components for the user interface.

As per **claim 27**, as best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd (see above), it recites a method, and the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 4 and 7, because the rejection for claims 4 and 7 covers the same or similar limitations as claim 27.

As per **claim 28**, as best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd (see above), the claim is interpreted as “a method of representing...”. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 4 and 7, because the rejection for claims 4 and 7 covers the same or similar limitations as claim 28.

As per **claim 29** (depending on claim 4), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 4 and 7, because the rejection for claims 4 and 7 covers the same or similar limitations as claim 29.

As per **claim 30** (depending on claim 4), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 4 and 7, because the rejection for claims 4 and 7 covers the same or similar limitations as claim 30, wherein the number ($\geq n$) of options displayed in block 26 (see rejection for claim 4) corresponds to the range increased or decreased, as claimed.

Art Unit: 2654

12. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SHAW as applied to claim 4, and further in view of MIYASHITA et al. (US 6,289,085) hereinafter referenced as MIYASHITA.

As per **claim 8** (depending on claim 4), even though SHAW discloses “a range of pronouncing dictionary data-bases”, “said data-bases providing additional phonetic detail to phonemic or allophonic level”, and “means for user-selection of the desired [dialectal] pronunciation” (col. 3, lines 41-67, ‘speech databases’, ‘dictionary source’, ‘phonemic transcription displayed in the phoneme field’, ‘a list of n-best (reflect a range) suggested phonetic transcriptions’, which includes phonetic detail to phonemic level; col. 4, lines 3-4, ‘the preferably selects one of these phonetic transcription (that closely matches the desired pronunciation)’), SHAW does not expressly disclose the corresponding “different **dialectal** pronunciations or **styles** of pronunciation” and selecting “the desired **dialectal** pronunciation or **style** of pronunciation”. However, the features are well known in the art as evidenced by MIYASHITA who voice mail system, voice synthesizing device and method therefor (title), comprising ‘voice font database’, ‘voice feature data to the rhythm control part’, ‘to generate pronunciation data giving reading and accent for output’ (col. 8, lines 27-43), and data structure of ‘voice feature data’ including ‘data giving a dialect’ (col. 15, lines 12-15 and Table 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify SHAW by providing voice font ^{or} database and selection of different voice feature data (different style of pronunciation), as taught by MIYASHITA, for the purpose (motivation) of providing a voice synthesizing device having a voice output with user voice feature (col. 1, lines 60-64).

Art Unit: 2654

13. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SHAW in view of FOREST as applied to claim 18, and further in view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

Regarding **claim 32** (depending on claim 28), SHAW in view of FOREST does not expressly disclose using "wild" indication when lack of a matching letter, as claimed. However, an official notice is taken in that the feature of using a "wild" indication (or wild card marker) for a special situation, such as lack of matching letter, is well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify SHAW in view of FOREST by providing a "wild" indication (or wild card marker) for a special situation, such as lack of matching letter, for the purpose (motivation) of providing a way of handling special situation for the text related processing.

Conclusion

14. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop ____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____


Art Unit: 2654

Randolph Building
Alexandria , VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (571) 272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

QH/qh
October 27, 2005



DAVID D. KNEPPER
PRIMARY EXAMINER